

No. 4.

Paul, the Apostle of Heathen Judaism

A DISCOURSE

BY

EMIL G. HIRSCH



BS
2505
H47
1894
GTU
Storage

THE REFORM ADVOCATE
BLOCH & NEWMAN, PUBLISHERS
DEARBORN STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

2505

447

1894

PAUL, THE APOSTLE OF HEATHEN JUDAISM, OR CHRISTIANITY.

Jesus founded no new religion; he formulated no new theology; he proclaimed no new creed. He preached repentance and promised the kingdom of Heaven; his instructions were pregnant with richest ethical thought. The Sermon on the Mount is undoubtedly the most abundant casket of jewels drawn from the treasure house of high moral inspiration. There is no other necklace so valuable as this; the world has prized it; and as long as suns will rise and moons will wax and wane in the nightly sky, as long as man has not lost that appreciation for purity which is the best heirloom given to him, these words of Jesus will come to the soul as the whispered proclamation of the highest. A greater contrast cannot well be conceived, than that presented by the official literature of the church three hundred, and two hundred years after Jesus' time, to his own—if his own they were—words and appeals. Prof. Hatch, in his Hibbert Lectures on the Influence of Greek Thought upon the Development of Christianity, calls attention especially to this contrast. Christianity, says he, begins with ethics: its passion is kindled by immorality; its anger is aroused by unrighteousness; its hopes center in the establishment of a kingdom of justice, and the path, narrow and

steep, to salvation runs along the heights of moral endeavor and moral uplook. The official church, on the other hand, is anchored to a creed; belief is essential, practice is held under contempt; and as the impulse to creed grows stronger with the circling years, conduct and character are considered to be mere dross—worthless chaff to be carried away by the wind; while faith, and faith alone is proclaimed to be the key wherewith to unlock the gateway of the hereafter, open only to those that accept, and closed to all others—be it through ignorance or be it through perversion—that do not accept the fundamental dogma.

Who is responsible for this utter change of attitude? Greek thought and Greek philosophy have dug this new channel, along which the waters welling from the Pools of Siloah ran along with ever more sluggish pace, while they might have flowed, had they been permitted to obey their own original roadbed, in limpid, crystal purity. Their enforced indolence made them an easy prey to the fickle sand sweeping down upon them from the banks of the new excavation, and threatened to throttle them in a swamp of their own making. The focus, so to speak, in which sunlight from Palestine's hills and thought waves from Athen's acropolis met, was the mind of Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles. No man has affected the destiny of our family so deeply and so permanently as has this tent-maker of Tarsus. Speak of the mighty heroes on battle field and in battle heat unmoved, who thundered forth, over legions too numerous to be counted, the word of advance; speak of the heroes of peace that spend their days in the search after truth, mounting the weary steps leading to the watch-tower of the night, to communicate with the

stars above, or descending into the very bowels of the earth to read the stony inscriptions treasuring the very records of our earth's creation; speak of those heroes of the mind that impatient of fragmentary knowledge, at personal sacrifice of time and treasure, sally forth into untrodden territories and brave the darts of the fever and the poisoned arrows of the hostile savages in their quest after information; speak of the giants of industry that link together distant zones by ligatures of iron and steel; or surgeons that cut the umbilical cord binding daughter island to mother continent. None of these has so materially, so deeply, so lastingly stamped his own thought upon the human race as has, and does to the present day, the poor, misshapen Jew, Roman citizen though he was, whose cradle stood at Tarsus and whose school years were spent at the feet of Jerusalem's patriarchs. Should ever, by some hap or other, the greatest lights be extinguished in the galaxy spanning the centuries, longer than any other star would scintillate above in power his name. Yea, none has so deeply, I repeat, affected the destiny of the human family as has Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles. On his account wars were waged; by his doctrine humanity was cleft into hostile camps; his words have been the burden of many a human soul and again have been the stay of as many other human hearts. He has cited the demons of terror to gather around the bed where agonized poor human mortal clay in terror and anxiety of what would come after the final struggle of life; and he has winged with confidence of peaceful hope and assurance other souls impatient to shuffle off this mortal coil and to enter the truer kingdom of light, of love and of life. Whatever our own religious opinions may be, this fact

alone should assure for his words and his doctrines a careful and a close attention.

We cannot understand Paul without first comprehending the peculiar change wrought by the contact of Jewish thought with Greek doctrines before his coming, which resulted in a certain phase of Judaism. Paul would be an impossibility, original as he is, without Philo before him, without Alexandrian Judaism as the mother well for him to drink from. Even the most original minds are linked to their antecedents; none—unless it be in modern time, where originality is as cheap as the mud in our city streets—none is self-made in the work shop where thought spins its eternal threads. What the best, what the brightest of our kind may hope to accomplish is to weave a new design into the pattern, but the threads which we employ and which we cast backward and forward with the flying shuttle are taken from the bobbin on which are wound the reflections of the men who lived before us. There is historical continuity and, therefore, historical connectedness in the evolution of thought. We stand on our past, and so did Paul rise to his giant stature on the shoulders of those that preceded him. When Jew came first in contact with Greek, a new opportunity opened for him. No greater distance can possibly be imagined between two poles of thought than is that which gapes between Greek and Jewish mind. The Greek is typically Aryan, as such it inclines to analysis, the Jewish to synthesis; the Greek scales to truth by the round of details; the Jew soars to truth by the energy of sentiment and feeling; the Jew is intensely personal, the Greek is as intensely abstract; the Jew reads world and nature in terms of an equation of personality in

which the two factors are rigidly kept apart; the original Semitic God is indeed living alone beyond the world; he governs the world, but he is not immanent in it. The original Semitic God idea has been preserved in the Koran, or perhaps I had better say carried therein to its furthest consistency. God and man are separated, and the cleavage between them is as impassable as is a gulch cut by the water courses in a rugged mountain. Even later Mohammedan theology and philosophy were unable to span that chasm with a bridge steady and secure. This Semitic God idea is modified, of course, in the theology of the prophets; but taking it as a whole it remains unshakably true, that Mohammed, and not Spinoza, is strikingly Semitic.

Universe and God are two divided poles for the Semite, while the Greek rather views them as one, differentiated under two aspects. The difficulty for Jew and Greek to understand each other was not the result of difference of language alone. The Greek could not conceive of an extra-mundane God; the gods of the Greeks lived in the world; they did not merely send forth the storms their messengers and command the lightning to run on their swift errands; they did not merely bid the waters stand still, or the sea to rise in wrath—the gods were the water, the gods were the winds. God was immanent, not transcendental.

But Jew and Greek a few centuries before Paul had come into closer communion. Alexander the Great, in his ambition to found a world empire, had mixed the ingredients of a new humanity with the pestle of war. Stamping and grinding humanity in the mortar he forced into closest contact Greek and Jew. In consequence of this, arose the necessity for the Jewish

thinkers in Alexandria to present their to the Greek utterly inconceivable system, in a form that might bring it nearer to the understanding of the Greek mind. Certain concepts found even in certain books of their old Hebrew Bible, stood them in good stead for this purpose. The so-called wisdom literature, in itself free from national bias and therefore more readily appealing to the sympathies of the Hellenized Jews of Egypt, proved the suggestive source of mediating thoughts; for in these books wisdom appears almost in the light of an independent essence under God through which the world is guided. On the other hand, as they became more familiar with Greek thought, they found something analogous to this in Plato's system. Greek philosophy had evolved the poetic notion, that God in creating the world had conceived first in his own mind the perfect universe; actual creation was merely clothing with visible reality the idea which had taken life and shape in the mind of the Creator. Platonism, or to be more accurate, Neo-Platonism reigned supreme in the academies of Alexandria. The view that God had associated with him a second energy, the ideas through which he acted upon the world, lay ready to hand. The abstract God in his sublime majesty was out of nexus with the universe; he had deputed the ideas to act in his behalf. The Jewish mind and the Greek had thus apparently come to the same conclusion. The Jewish current had reflected divine wisdom as the potency of creation; the Greek had emphasized a similar view, that God's ideas are the principles by which the world is called into being. Here was now promise of reconciliation; the two lines of thought had this point in common. Here they intersected. Idea and

"*Chokhmah*" are the *logos*, divine reason, the mediator which the Greek mind needed to link world to God and man to his supreme creator. It is a Jewish thinker, Philo, contemporaneous with Jesus, who systematizes this peculiar view of the universe. God creates the world through *logos*; God acts on the world through *logos*. In Philo, it is not clear whether *logos* be merely a hypostasis, projection of God himself, or it be a second personality of God himself. At all events, Philonism had thoroughly prepared the soil for the planting of the seed from which Paulinian theology could grow. From Philo it was but one step to Paul's dogma. The fourth gospel, whatever the age of its composition, before or after the epistles, is the echo of Hellenistic Alexandrian speculations. It identifies Christ with the *logos*. It is, now, not a wild guess, that in the island of Tarsus, his birthplace, Paul, who must have been a bright young man, had come under the influence of the conception that a spiritual mediatorship existed between God and the world. When at an early age he left Tarsus to go to Jerusalem, before probably the end had come to Jesus—though he personally never came into concourse and contact with the prophet of Nazareth, the schools which he attended, the academy in which he was enrolled a pupil of Gamaliel, a grandson of the famous Hillel, must not have been free from this teaching, while, on the other hand, the Galilean hills must have sounded the wonder deeds of Jesus, revered as none other by a certain class of people. After the death of Jesus, it seems that Paul went a second time from Tarsus to Jerusalem, where he met with some of the disciples who had come in contact with Jesus. It is more than likely that he heard from their

lips the story of his life adorned even so early with legend grown on the rich soil of love and theological conceptions. This story could not but have made a deep impression on him; though—a phenomenon so often noticed in the history of great men—the first impression was that of resistance to what he later burned to proclaim from the very housetops.

Paul was of noble birth. Nobility in those days was not of the blood exactly; it was certainly not of wealth. Who in those days constituted the aristocracy among the Jews; those whom to meet was deemed a rare privilege? Was it the millionaire? Ah! no; the touch of his hand was not the boon coveted. Was it the high priest, in ignorance but in pomp and state performing the measured functions of his office? No; learning wove the crown of glory in those days; and Paul was descended from a family of the tribe of Benjamin, in whom learning had been an ambition transmitted from father to son. In Jerusalem he was brought into closest sympathy with the Pharisees. Gamaliel at the head of the Academy was his own personal instructor. In such surroundings he could not but become imbued with the spirit of Judaism as polarized in the Pharisaic axis. He grew up a strict observer of the law and well versed in the dialectics which anchored the legal enactments upon the rock bed of the Pentateuchal texts. The first impulse, then, when he heard from lips of Nazarenes the story of the life and the death of Jesus, their prophet and Messiah, was one of resistance and horror. We know, from the story of his life, that among the persecutors of the young, rising Christian communities, none was perhaps so zealous and displayed such bitter fanaticism as Saul of Tarsus. He assisted at the lapi-

dation of Stephen, the brother of Jesus; he was ever thereafter fired with passion to crush out the growing heresy; he even went so far, weaponed with a letter of introduction from high authorities, as to repair to Damascus in order to denounce the refugees of the Christian brotherhood, fled to that city for safety. On the way to Damascus, an event took place which turned out to be for him of sublime and supreme moment,—marking a crisis in his whole life and giving an opposite turn to his ambitious activity. It is certain that he beheld Jesus; he himself says so. He heard the master's voice; he was met by him on the road to Damascus. Glorious light seemed to flood the horizon, and in that light he read the new promise and the new revelation. Bungling rationalism, the stock in trade of men like Ingersoll and others of his ilk, legitimate one hundred years ago, but to-day entirely out of rhyme with the thought of modern science on these questions, shrugging its shoulders with affectation of superior wisdom, would claim that either St. Paul invented the story in order to shield his change of heart, or, if he saw anything, he merely was dazzled by the zigzagging of lightning from the sky above. Orthodoxy, again, has claimed and does claim, that the Apostle actually did behold in the flesh him who was crucified. How do *we* account for the phenomena? Modern psychology has cast the light of its searching torch into the darkest nooks and corners of the human soul. We have recognized to-day the possibility of autohypnotism, "self-suggestion" of certain phenomena. Rivet your attention on one subject, be bound up in it so that, as it were, in it you lose your own identity; it will haunt you in your dreams and it will

persist at your elbow in your waking hours. Have you not had similar experiences? Have you not heard voices from the land beyond; have you not occasionally in the busy streets in Chicago turned to see whether face was behind you or form had followed you? And to a greater extent than this, though in the same psychological process involved, come such phenomena to great minds stirred up to their depths. A man organized as Saul of Tarsus was, could he escape pondering upon the peculiarities presented to him by the few Christians who then had with the tendrils of a loving soul embraced the story and the life of Jesus of Nazareth as a promise of the near dawn of kingdom come?

He could not; he had heard the story; he was a Jew of the Jews, strict in the performance of his duties arising under the law. He must have—for such theological minds are not born in an hour—he must often before have asked himself the question: What is the root of this constant dissatisfaction, which is the heirloom of every thinking mind and every feeling heart? Why is it that we crave for satisfaction and it as persistently eludes us? Why is it that the law does not satisfy me; why is it that I, the strict adherent of legal Judaism, am in constant danger of violating the law? Some of you who have been brought up under Jewish orthodox influence know what is implied in being a loyal Jew of the old school: not a motion of the hand but is tied to an article of the code; not a twitching of the finger but will brush against some other paragraph of the law. The conclusion is not far off—though not altogether true—that one is not free, but bound under the law, a slave under law. That mechanical legalism cannot still the inborn yearning, is an unavoidable ex-

perience. It adds a new thorn to the flesh. This experience must have been Paul's. He must have fretted and chafed under the "Yoke of the Law," for he committed the error of overlooking the spirituality of the "Law." He confounded *Thorah* with *nomos* and reduced Judaism to a mere chain of legal enactments. And now he came in contact with a community of men, Jews, too—for the early Christians were Jews—observing the law as scrupulously as he did, but who apparently had found the peace he craved, their eyes glistened with a hope new to him; they braved death to witness to their new confidence; they expatriated themselves even and complained not. He had been a spectator at the execution of Stephen and must have been touched by his heroism. How often has death on the gallows been the portal for the propagation of an idea? For you cannot retard the march of ideas by hanging a few wretches who are its exponents. They may kill till doomsday in Paris the demented men that throw the bombs, but the idea which even through their barbarous perversion would have a hearing, will knock at the gate until it has performed its errand. The very stone cast of Jesus's brother became the corner-stone of the church, and Paul, assisting at the sacrifice, could not defend himself against the impression left by the fate of him who was executed. Plead for capital punishment, as has been done in this city of late by men even who claim to have the monopoly of all ethical ideas, if you must; capital punishment is absolutely impotent, and it is and remains a relic of barbarism. Not one that is executed but becomes in a certain sense a hero. The worst criminal "dying game" is not a deterrent but an incentive to his comrades in

crime! Not alone once, a thousand times has history verified this judgment; the death of Stephen is one of the many proofs of this historical proclamation. On the way to Damascus he must have yielded more and more at every step to his pre-occupation, pondering and pondering the mystery of his own soul and the fortitude of the persecuted until his nerves were strung to their last tension. Thought and nerve are inseparable companions. Cool, calm men that cannot be disturbed, but rarely explore the depths of passionate convictions. Nervous temperaments are the prerequisites of such as would unhinge the gates, behind which are held the chariots of onward moving mankind. Creative genius cannot light its tapers in the rainbow colors of an iceberg, tipped with sun-light. Its lamp blazes forth where Vulcan heats the hearth and blows the bellows. Every prophet is of the volcanic guild. And Paul had within his bones the "consuming fire."

With his thoughts concentrated on this one ruling idea and perplexity, the crisis came to him as it did to the prophets of old. There stood before him—as though in flesh and bone—the vision. His ears tingled with voices. Did they have their cradle within him? What that to him? He saw, he heard—and he succumbed. The vexation he had puzzled over so long had at last overpowered him. And he came to Damascus a changed man; Saul the persecutor was changed into Paul the Apostle.

His further personal history does not interest us in this connection. We are in quest not so much of a detailed itinerary of his checkered life, as we are of a succinct exposition of his fundamental ideas. The Jesus

that he had seen on his way to Damascus now took in his system the place of the "*logos*" of Philo. He became the "mediator" between God and man. He was *one* with God. Paul could all the more readily so conceive of *logos*-Jesus, as in the rabbinical theology the *Thorah* was represented as pre-existent in God, God's veritable only born son; and to it was assigned, though rather poetically than dogmatically, the mediating character. But whence the need of a mediator? From the first, Paul in his epistles is busy discussing the relation of man to God. Are God and man at peace, or are they divided? Psychology seems to point to the second member of the alternative. Man is hounded by dissatisfaction, and still has the craving for perfection, though he cannot attain unto it. Led by this common experience, Paul is led into a fundamental error—upon which rests his whole system. He confounds the inward gnawing sense of dissatisfaction and imperfection with sin, and he makes of sin, not the violation of one law or another, but a state. Sin is a state! Originally perfection was man's dower. But he lost it. Sin is the curse brought upon the race by its own ancestors. It is of Adam; and through Adam has come upon all descended from Adam. Originally man was free from this dissatisfaction; originally man was made perfect; but Adam sinned, and his sin fixed its own resulting condition upon all of his children. The idea of transmissal of guilt is not Jewish. The Semite seems, however, to have inclined to the view that character depends upon ancestry. (See Wellhausen, *Skizzen* III. p. 194.) Jewish law recognizes to a certain extent the heredity of evil, but limits the operation to four generations. Yahweh, Yahweh, All-merciful

and gracious, preserving his love unto thousands of generations, but visiting the sins of the fathers upon the sons, the sons of the sons again to the fourth generation. Further than this, according to the Jewish notion, the baneful effect of sin does not extend. I will not attempt to prove the correctness of this limitation; perhaps natural science may take exception to this, and have cogent reasons to insist that a still more remote ancestor than the great grandfather is responsible for our shortcomings. I merely would recall the fact that Jewish thought, when emphasizing the antithesis between the everlasting blessing of good, and the limited visitation of evil, fixes the fourth generation as the self-extinction of sin. Moreover, Ezekiel announces most clearly that son shall not die for the guilt of the father. Among the Greeks this idea was greatly spread. The old Greek tragedies are written in the same fundamental keys in which Paul's proclamation runs. The Greek dramatists speculate on and operate with black *Ate*, the black fate of sin that roots in the family and is transmitted from generation to generation, until expiation or atonement is made.

In Paul the notion of transmissal of guilt, arrested merely by expiation, is Greek, not Jewish, however much he may strain in true Rabbinical fashion Biblical texts to prove his point. That a substitute may neutralize the consequences of some other's deeds is also a thought which the Jewish mind has not evolved. It rises from the back-ground of ancient tribal organization; and the involved institution of the blood avenger. Blood for blood, in which the life of one of the clan does answer for the life of the other. The *Gool Haddam* misapplied, is root to Paul's idea of vi-

carious atonement. The Greeks, on the other hand, were not disinclined to such a view. For instance in *Prometheus Bound* by Aeschylus, Hermes addresses stubborn and suffering Prometheus thus: "Of such agony hope not the end, before a substitute for thy torture, a god, appears; then have thee ready for thee to descend to sunless Hades." We have some idea of a god offering himself a vicarious atonement for the sin of Prometheus; and before such expiation, he cannot be freed. Of Greek origin thus appears this element of Paul's soteriology. Sin is death. Redemption therefore includes the victory over death. He who came to save the world, rises from the dead. The notion of the resurrection was familiar to the Jews. This is not the place to discuss the mooted question when and whence this doctrine formed a foothold in Jewish thought. In the Pharisaic hope, it was a cardinal element. However, Paul gives it a new direction. In the twist which he gave the familiar notion, no Jew had entertained it. A national hope was dwarfed into a single event, in turn forced to bolster a dogmatic construction. As in this case, so in many more Paul borrows his terms and ideas even from current Jewish phraseology; but in each instance he applies his material in a way anti-Jewish. In the Jewish Haggada, *e. g.*, the indications are not few that certain conceptions had been current among the Jews. But this is the difference: In Paul's system they are crystalized into a dogma, in the Jewish Haggada they are poetic solutions.

The deterioration consequent upon the "fall" are dwelt on in the Haggada of the rabbis, but their statements are translucent legends, not opaque and obscure dogmas. Before Adam sinned he was so tall that his

of the world to the other; when he sinned, God laid his hand upon him and reduced him to the common mortal size. The Haggada operates also with the equation, sin and death and satan and serpent. But it cannot be repeated too often, these extravagances are indulged in for purposes of homiletic applications of Biblical texts. As dogmas these legends are anti-Jewish. Judaism, whatever its qualification, rejects the dogma of original sin, and the consequent need of justification by faith in the vicarious atonement of the second Adam, came to wash away with his blood the sin of the first. The distinction between the grace of God and his justice, so fundamental in Paul's dogmatic exposition, is not a free invention of his. The "mercy-seat" and the "throne of justice" of God are standing figures of speech in Rabbinical sermons. But as Judaism, whatever may be said to the contrary, did *never* teach a God of wrath, who must be propitiated by blood—See Micah's words in the sixth chapter of his prophecy—the whole theory of Paul is a departure from, not an exposition of Judaism. As Philo views everything in the O. T. as a symbol and allegory, so Paul regards it as a type. Adam is type. The sacrificial ritual is typical of the one final supreme sacrifice. His antithesis between *law* and *love* falls into the same category. Though the O. T. itself protests that "Love God" demands not sacrifice, Judaism is regarded as mere legalism. What is, according to Paul, the province of this old Jewish law, and why was the world left to its cruel fate so long? Why were men by God abandoned so long to go to perdition? Paul was a thinker. He felt the difficulty of the question. In the epistle to the Romans he gives the answer. God

delayed redemption so long that the world under sin might recognize that life outside of God was the high-road to perdition. Sin is the very glory of God. Sin had to run its destiny, so that in the conviction of the gentile world should come at last the day when, despair seizing them, they found their culture broken reeds on which to support themselves. The case of the Jews was somewhat different. The law, God-given would indeed make perfect were it possible for man to fulfill the law, but the law cannot be fulfilled. From his premises, Paul is right in saying that the law, instead of decreasing sin, increases it. There is none that is perfect, that is the experience of the law. The law in thus, instead of diminishing the sense of sin, enhancing it, was a pedagogue unto Christ. The Law must yield to faith. Faith in Jesus, who conquered through his resurrection death, and who was born into this world without sin, gives us back the heirloom taken from us by Adam's disobedience. Those that accept shall enter into new life; they are regenerated, born anew as it were, a new nature put into them.

The young church was soon ablaze with the controversy about the further obligatory character of the law. Was the new message for the world, or was it merely for the Jew? Paul took the bold step: he planted himself on the basis, that as the law was merely a pedagogue unto Christ, with the coming of Christ the law was for the Christian abrogated. St. Peter, the Jewish apostle, and the Jew-Christians, claimed that the law was not set aside; that in order to join the new community, circumcision was essential. Had Paul not taken the stand he did, Christianity would not have spread. Judaism before Paul's time had begun to extend its influence, but

the barriers of the law kept out a waiting world. In the days of Paul men were yearning for a new light, they were athirst and cried out, as the children of Israel in the desert cried out to Moses: Give us water, that we may drink. But Peter, as the Jews before him, insisted the barriers shall stand; none shall be admitted except he have the seal of the covenant in his flesh. Paul with one bold sweep of the pen opened the gates for the conquest and conversion of the world. Had the Jews of that time been able to read the inscription on the wall, had they looked at the hand on the dial, they might have reclaimed the world with the ethics, their own ethics, lived and taught by Jesus of Nazareth; they might have gone forth and brought to the thirsty the water, to the hungry the bread of life. But they would not, as to-day they will not. The times were ripe; Judaism neglected the opportunity. Paul embraced it. He preached in words comprehensible to the pagan world the doctrine which he had discovered in his own God-touched heart. Yea; there is much at which we take exception in his system. We do not grant that Judaism is law; the prophetic system is not law, legalism is a compromise. The Judaism of the prophets is not law. This no one has recognized so deeply as one whose whole life work was to show this error in Paul's conception of Judaism. Consult Dr. Samuel Hirsch's exposition of our religion if you would learn that, while antagonistic to Paulinian dogmatism and mysticism, it is not nomism.

Judaism itself has broken with legalism; but it does not commit with Paul the mistake to underrate ethical action. Faith, certainly men must have; without faith the world must come to an end. Ye who love your

children and work for humanity, mind, Faith is the steam that turns the wheels of humanity. But this faith is not the mystic something which, Paul holds, leads to salvation. Is character nothing? Paul's exaggeration of faith is a reaction upon the legalism of the synagogue. Why is it that so many brought up among our orthodox will have nothing of Judaism after they escape from their tutors? Why is it that ethical culture finds nowhere so eager recruits as from among the ranks of the orthodox Jews?

Mendelssohn's fate illustrates the reason. His own children went forth from Judaism and separated from it. The Mendelssohns are no longer Jews, they are officially Christians; it was the legalism of Mendelssohn that superinduced their apostasy. Paul from being a Pharisee 'Hassid had to go to the other extreme. He accentuated faith and despised work. But the world is once more coming around to the other pole. Paulinian Christianity is gradually developing into the Christianity of Jesus. Christianity of this latter order and our religion are twin brothers. Character is the sacramental word of our religion. This Paul did not understand; this Jesus understood; this we understand. Paul's great deed was to carry Jewish thought, even in his form, into the world. He left behind the narrow confines of Judaism to win the globe. His fate and the experience of his movements is full of instruction. Did the freedom which Paul craved ever come? It did not. The slavery of the law was exchanged for the shackles of creed and dogma; the free thought and the free life which he coveted did not ensue. And so it will be in these latter days. Separate from Judaism! Freedom will soon yield to a new slavery. Liberalism is safest

when protected by the historical associations with Judaism. As yet the Christian church is too potent for us to loosen what historical connection we have. It is a law that smaller bodies are attracted by the larger. Around the sun spin a thousand asteroids; they are largely of the sun; but the sun draws them back and feeds upon his own offspring. And so it is with unhistorical liberal movements; instead of leading to larger liberty, they event in greater slavery. Best protected is liberal thought, the religion of character, in its historical frame; we can work from this fulcrum to lift the world. This is our conviction. There is no necessity to leave Judaism to win the world. Open your gates, but let it be *your* gates, for the righteous to enter thereinto.

That much we may learn from the history of Paul's church. The apostle was a man of little prepossessing appearance; a man racked by disease; a man whose eyes were weak; a man who had to win his livelihood in the sweat of his brow; a man of whom no one would have dreamt that under the misshapen body burned a fire-consumed soul. In such ungainly frame God's spirit loves to dwell occasionally. This tent-maker, blear-eyed, disease-racked, lifted the Roman world out of its hinges. The world has learned to distil the waters of its faith, to filter them once more. And what is the purified stream? As the religion of the dogmatist is separated, there will be found the religion of Jesus, which is our religion: Judaism universal.